CF 5004

005

IN THE COURT OF HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH

JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

PETITIONERS :-

1. PARSU son of Bhanu
Kodar Canal Sub Division No.2
Mahasamund, P.O.Mahasamund
Tahsil and District Mahasamund
Chhattisgarh.

2. Smto Hero Bai wife of
Itwari,
Kodar Project, Sub Division
Mahasamund,
Resident of Gram Konwajhar
Tahsil and District Mahasamund
Chhattisgarh.

3. Smt. Bismat Bai wife of
Anand Ram ,
Kodar Project, Sub Division
Mahasamund,
Resident of Gram Tumgona,
Tahsil and District Mahsamund.
Chhattisgarh.

4. Smt. Sukala Bai wife of
Khorbahara,
Kodar Project Sub Division
Mahasamund,
Resident of Gram Bhoring
Tahsil Mahasamund, District
Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.

5. Thakur Ram Sinha son of
Shri Jalam Singh Sinha,
P.W.D. Department,
Mahasamund,
President, Chhattisgarh
Laghu Vetan Fourth Class
Govt. employee.

..2.

P.R. No. 3484/03
Presented by Shri C.R. Sahu
dated 01/11/03

RECEIVED-COPY
01/11/03
Clerk to A.G. Bilaspur

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :-

1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through Addl. Chief Secretary
Secretariat , D.K.S.Bhawan,
Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2. Secretary,
Irrigation Department
(Water Resources)
D.K.S.Bhawan, Raipur Chhattis-
garh.

3. Engineer In Chief,
Irrigation Department,
Raipur , District Raipur (C.G.).

4. Chief Engineer,
Kodar Project, Raipur,
District Raipur (C.G.).

5. Executive Engineer,
Kodar Project Division
Mahasamund, District
Mahasamund, C.G.

6. Sub Divisional Engineer,
Kodar Project Mahasamund,
District Mahasamund (C.G.).

7. State of Madhya Pradesh
Govt. of Madhya Pradesh
Through - Secretary,
Bhopal (M.P.).

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 / 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

1. PARTICULARS OF THE PETITIONERS :-

As mentioned in the cause title.

2. PARTICULARS OF THE RESPONDENTS :-

As mentioned in the cause title.

XI-HC-78

068

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ....W.P. 3612/03..... **सन् 200**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	15.09.2005 Mr. S.K. Dadsena, learned counsel for the petitioner(s). Mr. V.V.S. Murthy, & Mr. P.S. Koshy, learned Dy. Advocate Generals with Mr. Pankaj Shrivastava & Mr. Vivek Sharma, learned Panel Lawyers for the State of Chhattisgarh. Order passed separately, signed and dated. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	

Brajesh

26.9.05

5/10/05

(42)

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Single Bench : Satish K. Agnihotri, J

WRIT PETITION NO. 1914 of 2004

Bisahu Ram Yadav

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh & Others

WRIT PETITION NO. 756 of 2003

Sevak Ram

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh & Others

WRIT PETITION NO.2237 of 2003

Teji Lal Kurmi

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh & Others

WRIT PETITION NO.1271 of 2004

Kashiram Dheemar

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh & Others

WRIT PETITION NO.1698 of 2004

Ledga Ram Rawat

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh & Others

WRIT PETITION NO. 1709 of 2004

Panchu Ram

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh & Others

WRIT PETITION NO. 1766 of 2004

Paras Dheewar

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh & Others

WRIT PETITION NO. 2275 of 2004

Fekulal Sahu

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh & Others

WRIT PETITION NO.3612 of 2003

Parsu & Others

Vs.

State of Chhattisgarh and others

WRIT PETITION NO.1507 of 2002

Samaru

Vs.

State of Chhattisgarh and others

Mr. Vinay Pandey, Mr. Sunil Ottwani and Mr. S.K. Dadsena, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Present : Mr. V.V.S. Murthy, & Mr. P.S. Koshy, learned Dy. Advocate Generals with Mr. Pankaj Shrivastava & Mr. Vivek Sharma, learned Panel Lawyers for the State of Chhattisgarh.

ORDER
(Passed on 15th September, 2005)

The petitioners in this batch of writ petitions are working as casual labour gangs. The date of retirement was 55 years, as per circular dated 09.03.2000. The respondent State subsequently by circular dated 16.08.2004 increased the age of retirement from 55 years to 60 years. This Court in W.P. No.1149 of 2003 has considered this dispute as to whether the casual labour gangs, who have retired on attaining the age of 55 years be given the benefit of the circular dated 09.03.2000 for the purpose of retirement on 60 years, and order dated 29.09.2004 of this Court covers squarely the dispute involved in this batch of cases.

Accordingly, the petitions are disposed of in terms of the order dated 29.09.2004 passed by this Court in W.P. No.1149 of 2003.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Brajesh